

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/605,352	09/24/2003	Samuel R. Levatino	R212	2351
22692 7	590 07/08/2004		EXAMINER	
REGINALD F ROBERTS JR			SIRMONS, KEVIN C	
PO BOX 4535 BATON ROUGE, LA 70821-4535			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	<i></i> , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		3763	
			DATE MAILED: 07/08/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/605,352	LEVATINO, SAMUEL R.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kevin C. Sirmons	3763	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.11 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply 15 NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period was a reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ting within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	mely filed  ys will be considered timely.  the mailing date of this communication.  ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 S	eptember 2003.		
2a) ☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☑ This	action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for alloward closed in accordance with the practice under E			
Disposition of Claims			
<ul> <li>4)  Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray</li> <li>5)  Claim(s) is/are allowed.</li> <li>6)  Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.</li> <li>7)  Claim(s) is/are objected to.</li> <li>8)  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or</li> </ul>	wn from consideration.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine			
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc			
Applicant may not request that any objection to the			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	·		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	•		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicat rity documents have been receiv u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	tion No red in this National Stage	
Attachment(s)	4) [ ]	v (DTO 442)	
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D		
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>9/24/03</u> .	5) Notice of Informal (6) Other:	Patent Application (PTO-152)	

Application/Control Number: 10/605,352

Art Unit: 3763

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claims 4, 5, 13 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Where applicant acts as his or her own lexicographer to specifically define a term of a claim contrary to its ordinary meaning, the written description must clearly redefine the claim term and set forth the uncommon definition so as to put one reasonably skilled in the art on notice that the applicant intended to so redefine that claim term. *Process Control Corp. v. HydReclaim Corp.*, 190 F.3d 1350, 1357, 52 USPQ2d 1029, 1033 (Fed. Cir. 1999). The term "pressure" and "vacuum" in claims 4 and 5 are used by the claim to mean "therapeutic", while the accepted meaning is "a fluid." The term is indefinite because the specification does not clearly redefine the term.

As to claims 4, 5, 13 and 15, it is unclear how pressure and vacuum are regarded as a therapeutic agent.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Application/Control Number: 10/605,352

Art Unit: 3763

Claims 1, 3-10, and 12-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kwan U.S. Pat. No. 6,135,769.

Kwan discloses a microtube comprising: a tubular member (1); an interior axial opening (fig. 1); and a side port (3 and 2); Note: the device of Kwan is fully capable of performing the functions as set forth by applicant; as to claim 3, (fig. 1); as to claim 4-6, when the syringe applies a therapeutic agent (col. 3), it also applies the agent with pressure and a syringe action can be reversed to cause vacuum action. As to claim 7-10, 12-15, see above rejections; as to claim 16, see 2112.02 and above rejection; as to claims 17-19, (see above rejection).

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2, 11, 20 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kwan.

Kwan discloses a micro tube substantially as claimed except for an outside diameter of about 10 to about one hundred microns, and an inside diameter of from about five to about fifty microns. It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to chance the size of the microtube, since such a modification would have involved a mere change in the size of a component. A change in size is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art. In re Rose, 105 USPQ 237 (CCPA 1955).

Application/Control Number: 10/605,352

Art Unit: 3763

### Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communication from the examiner should be directed to Kevin C. Sirmons whose telephone number is (703) 306-5410. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday from 6:30 am to 4:00 pm. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Fridays.

Kevin C. Sirmons

Nevin C. Sermons

Patent Examiner

7/1/04